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| 78 | $4-4$ | A $10 \times x$ <br> Qxxx | 3 <br> 2 | $50 \%$ <br> $100 \%$ | Play ace then low to low or finesse king, or play low <br> Play ace then low to low or finesse king |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Example Cards | Holding | Tricks Percentage | Best play |  |  |

## Test your suit combinations

Those fond of looking up suit combinations will recognise the table above (from the Encyclopedia of Bridge - once my bible, now it's Mrs Google). You need three tricks from A1072 opposite Q654 - it's either your trump suit, or you need to make three tricks from the suit playing another strain.

Let's say you follow the recommended line, low to the ace and low to the nine and?

Low works, queen loses to the king.
Playing face-to-face, a tricky (i.e. unethical player) may break tempo when the suit is played, trying to spot a tic on either opponent's face, but only the speed of the card (or a really high res camera) will be able to gain from such a psychological ploy.

Board 6, South deals, EW vulnerable

$$
\text { - J } 93
$$

- 643
- 742
- K 1054

| - A 1072 |  | - Q 654 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Q 10987 | $w^{N}{ }_{\text {E }}$ | - AK5 |
| - A98 | $\mathrm{w}^{\text {S }}$ | - Q J 10 |
| * Q |  | - AJ7 |
|  | - K 8 |  |
|  | - J 2 |  |
|  | -K653 |  |
|  | -98632 |  |

19 pairs failed in slam (hearts, spades and notrumps basically all need a correct guess in spades) while eight lucky declarers guessed right.

Of those who failed, three led low from the ace towards the queen, and three ran $\stackrel{Q}{ }$, which could work on some combinations but is not the textbook play.
I studied some of the players who succeeded. One declarer played low to the 10 , giving themselves no option but to succeed when $\uparrow$ K came down under the ace.

Not a great slam, but if I made it, I would take the 12.79 IMPs it paid out as a dividend.

## Which ace to lead?

Nick Fahrer brought to my attention a problem an opponent failed to solve.

The South defender was on lead holding \&AJ76, -654, A10832, 6 after the auction below:

| West | North |
| :--- | :--- |
| Fahrer |  |
| 10 | pass |
| 2 | pass |
| 3 | pass |
| 5 | pass |



1. Shortage agreeing clubs
2. Cuebid

## SWPT Qualifying, Day 1

Board 20, West deals, all vulnerable

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Q Q } 92 \\
& \text { 102 } \\
& \text { Q U } 64 \\
& +1083
\end{aligned}
$$

- 83
-Q 7
-K 975
\& AK975

At the end of play, North was still waiting for South's reopening double. I am surprised any South in AD 2022 chose to pass: the hand has the right shape and strength. My agreement with partners is simple: with $8+\mathrm{HCP}$ and the right shape, a takeout double is mandatory in the passout seat.

1 was only two down.
One of Mrs Google's sources said it should be 9+ HCP, but I'm going to take this advice:

Fourth seat \& two passes. Should you pass with 8+ HCP?

Probably not. To decide if you can bid in the fourth seat after two passes (hence the name "pass-out seat"), you can "borrow an imaginary king" from your partner, and reassess your ability to bid as if you were in the second seat.

Hell, yes.
At the other table, one of our correspondents chose not to open the West hand, despite it complying to the Rule of 20 ( 10 HPC + 10 cards in two suits).

When West passed, North opened 1『, and over a 14 bid by South and 2NT from North, 3NT made 12 tricks on 6 lead.


Ed: Nick, don't you have Andrew Robson's The Next Level in stock at The Bridge Shop?

I checked the ASHTON match (ASHTON were SWPT winners) to see whether l'm barking up the wrong tree.

At one table, West opened 1『, doubled by North (not waiting for a takout double), and South bid 14. North rebid 1NT, and 3NT was reached easily.

At the other West opened $2 \vee$. When North bid 2NT, South checked for a spade fit with 3*.

Both declarers made 12 tricks in notrumps for a flat board.

| ¢ K 1085 |  | - Q 96 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - A98742 | $w^{N}{ }_{\text {E }}$ | $\checkmark 3$ |
| - J | s | -9543 |
| - Q 10 |  | - 8654 |

- A432
- 6
-K Q 762
- 972

West North East South all pass

## Ruff and throw in

Ian Thomson was one of the 15 successful declarers in $6 \checkmark$ from the South seat on the deal below

## SWPT Qualifying, Round 1

Board 7, South deals, all vulnerable

- K 10543
- ---
-K32
* A Q J 96

| - J 9 |  |  | - Q 862 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark 76$ |  | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{E}$ | - J 542 |
| -QJ105 |  |  | - 876 |
| -87543 |  |  | +K2 |
| - A 7 |  |  |  |
| - AKQ10983 |  |  |  |
| - A 94 |  |  |  |
| - 10 |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
|  | Klinger |  | Thomson |
|  |  |  | 2* |
| pass | 24 | pass | 39 |
| pass | 4* | pass | 4 |
| pass | 52 | pass | 69 |

Despite the misfit in hearts, once lan Thomson showed 9+ playing tricks, it was inevitable slam would be reached. Ron Klinger showed his positive with both black suits, and cuebid 5 over Thomson's $4 \diamond$ cuebid.
$\checkmark$ Q was led at most tables.
 Thomson won in hand, and played three rounds of trumps, getting the bad news about a heart loser. He threw two clubs and a diamond from dummy on the top hearts. Now the hand more or less plays itself.

AA and a spade to the king sees both opponents follow. Thomson ruffed a spade to hand, noting West's show out in spades. Throwing East in with $\uparrow \mathrm{J}$, she exited a diamond to dummy's king, so Thomson could play a fourth spade, establishing 10 as the $12^{\text {th }}$ trick.

At one table, West led a club, and now it was more difficult to make the heart slam, although now there is the ruffing finesse in clubs to fall back on.

## Time to shine

NZ women's team representatives Christine and Jenna Gibbons EW (they are also mother and daughter) faced Australian women's team representatives Elizabeth Havas Diana Smart NS, so one would expect a tough match.

National Women's Teams, Round 3
Board 30, East deals, nil vulnerable

- 93
$\checkmark$ A 10
-K J 3
- 107653

```
ヘQ 54
- Q J 6
- Q 1095
- K Q 4
- AK876
```



```
- 832
-A876
```



```
- J 102
-K975
-42
- A J 82
\begin{tabular}{llll} 
West & North & East & South \\
C Gibbons & E Havas & J Gibbons & D Smart \\
& & \(2 \boldsymbol{2}\) & pass \\
3 & pass & 3 & all pass
\end{tabular}
```

I assume Christine Gibbons' 3 bid described an invitational raise, with 34 a signoff.

Diana Smart led 2 at trick one, and when Jenna Gibbons won in hand to play Smart had to win to hold declarer to nine tricks.

When she didn't, Gibbons was in dummy with a club honour. Pehaps she should play a diamond now (with all the pips, the Encyclopedia recommends running $\downarrow$ Q), as entries to dummy are scarce.

Instead she drew trumps ending in hand, and played A and a second diamond.

Now the defence was back in the winners' circle. Havas, in with $>J$ played a club, which Gibbons had to ruff. Another diamond to Havas' king and another club ruff left Gibbons with no trumps left and only eight winners. A simple slip in cardplay had turned 10 tricks to eight.

At the other table, Giselle Mundell opened the East hand 14, and Rena Kaplan bid 3NT, a flat game force with spade support, so now the NZ defence was to be tested.

South, Judy Pawson led $\mathbf{~ J}$, won in Mundell's hand with a spade honour. Mundell too went after clubs at trick two. Pawson did well to rise ace, but now she had to find a heart switch.

When she shifted to a diamond instead, she not only set up declarer's diamonds but lost the two heart tricks available for the defence.

Mundell made quick work of drawing trumps and discarding two hearts on the established KQ.

A game bonus to HUMPHRIES and a small minus for GIBBONS led to 10 IMPs for HUMPHRIES, in a match won by HUMPHRIES 35-21 IMPs.

## SWPT datum winners

Thanks to a benefactor, new gold medals for pairs with the highest datums in the qualifying rounds of various elite events (currently the Victor Champion Cup, the Gold Coast Congress and the South West Pacific Teams) are to be awarded. Winning the SWPT datum field, having played all eight matches are John Wang - Gary Chen.

| National Open Teams Round of 16 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Results after 4 stanzas |  |
| ASHTON (1) TONY LEIBOWITZ - NABIL EDGITON - SARTAJ HANS - ANDY HUNG - SOPHIE ASHTON - PETER GILL | 155 |
| BRAHMA (2) GWYNEIRA BRAHMA - MIMI PACKER - DEANA WILSON - JANE REYNOLDS | 52 |
|  |  |
| THOMSON (3) TONY NUNN - PAUL DALLEY - RON KLINGER - MATT MULLAMPHY - IAN THOMSON | 151 |
| DOBES (4) WIESLAW PRZEWOZNIAK (sub) - LES GREWCOCK - WITOLD CHYLEWSKI (JUN) - STEVEN BOCK - WARREN DOBES | 65 |
|  |  |
| STERN (5) PABLO LAMBARDI - ROBERT GRYNBERG - RODRIGO GARCIA DA ROSA - TOM MOSS - PAUL GOSNEY - DAVID STERN | 86 |
| SIMPSON (6) ROBERT SIMPSON - LIZ FISHER - BLAIR FISHER - JEFF MILLER - PAM LIVINGSTON - JO SIMPSON | 111 |
|  |  |
| HUGHES (7) CHRIS HUGHES - DAVID WESTON - KIM MORRISON - JULIAN FOSTER | 101 |
| CRICHTON (8) GRAHAM WAKEFIELD - ROSS CRICHTON - PAM CRICHTON - NIEK VAN VUCHT | 37 |
|  |  |
| JEFFERY (9) SHI ZENG - HERMAN YUAN - YUMIN LI - PETER JEFFERY - ROBERT CASE | 79 |
| ZHOU (10) MICHAEL CHEN - WATSON ZHOU - CHARLIE LU - WILIIAM ZHANG | 133 |
|  |  |
| GUMBY (11) ROBERT FRUEWIRTH - JAMIE THOMPSON - WARREN LAZER - PAULINE GUMBY | 116 |
| HOFFMAN (12) DAVID WAWN - DAVID HOFFMAN - IAN ROBINSON - NEIL EWART | 67 |
|  |  |
| COUTTS (13) MICHAEL WARE - NICK JACOB - GEO TISLEVOLL - LIAM MILNE - JAMES COUTTS - MATTHEW MCMANUS | 158 |
| GIURA (14) NICOLETA GIURA - JAMIE EBERY - NICK HUGHES - KIM FRAZER | 51 |
|  |  |
| ROSENDORFF (15) ANDREW BRAITHWAITE - TERRY BROWN - ARJUNA DE LIVERA - NIGEL ROSENDORFF - PHIL GUE - PETER BUCHEN | 96 |
| JACOB (16) STEPHANIE JACOB - MAURITS VAN DER VLUGT - AVINASH KANETKAR - DAVID BEAUCHAMP - BRIAN MACE - TOM JACOB | 81 |
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